



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/507,088

08/23/2005

Hans-Joachim Weinand

OST-041369

8836

22876 7590 03/11/2009

FACTOR & LAKE, LTD  
1327 W. WASHINGTON BLVD.  
SUITE 5G/H  
CHICAGO, IL 60607

EXAMINER

LAMB, BRENDA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/11/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/507,088	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WEINAND, HANS-JOACHIM	
	<b>Examiner</b> Brenda A. Lamb	<b>Art Unit</b> 1792	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Brenda A Lamb/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's argument that the dripping zone is disposed in the path of motion or travel of the articles and positioned downstream of a last bath which excludes positioning of the dripping zone above the bath or the electrodeposition bath 20 is found to be non-persuasive since any area or space downstream with reference to the conveying direction or path of motion of the articles relative to the bath includes the area above the bath wherein the articles are positioned to travel to the following process stage. Sugane et al at paragraph 0077-0084 discusses elements of its process as depicted in Figure 1 and downstream of each treatment station, station 4 and 8, are located the following stations: washing station, stations 5 and 9 located in a floor conveyor position; washing station, station 6 and 10 in the overhead conveyor position, and pure washing station 7 and 11 in floor conveyor. position. Sugane et al teaches in paragraph 0079 that draining or dripping occurs in addition to pure water washing in station 7 and obviously station 11 which is also in the same position as station 7 includes draining. Therefore, for the sole purpose of clarification the examiner maintains that the articles supported by the WO '482 feed carriage as claimed may be or is capable of being tilted into and from an angular position related to horizontal to facilitate drainage at a position which is downstream relative to the travel direction of articles exiting the bath since Sugane et al shows arranging a dripping zone or open space downstream of the bath relative to direction of the articles which includes the path exiting the bath wherein the articles can be or may be tilted to drip the material therefrom downstream of the bath for the obvious reason to enable one to coat or treat the article with different materials without cross-contamination of the materials between the different stations which apply different materials. Furthermore, it would have been obvious given the modifications of the WO '482 apparatus as discussed above to arrange a drier downstream of the dripping zone since Sugane et al teaches arranging a drier downstream of the dripping zone and last treating bath for the obvious reason to enable one to coat or treat the article with different materials without cross-contamination of the coating material between the coating stations which apply different coating/treatment materials.

All arguments set forth in the instant after-final amendment are well taken, however, rejections of the claims under the prior art is sustained for the reasons set forth in the final office action.